

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 EMIL LAWRENCE,  
8 Plaintiff,  
9 v.  
10 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN  
11 FRANCISCO, et al.,  
Defendants.

12  
13 Case No. 14-cv-00820-MEJ

14  
15 **ORDER RE: ADMINISTRATIVE  
16 MOTION TO MODIFY PROTECTIVE  
17 ORDER**

18 Re: Dkt. No. 57

19  
20 On November 24, 2014, the Court entered a Stipulated Protective Order in this case, while  
21 Plaintiff Emil Lawrence represented himself pro se. Dkt. No. 26. On July 31, 2015, the Court  
22 appointed pro bono counsel for Plaintiff, who now moves for administrative relief to modify the  
23 protective order and enter one based on this District's model protective order. Dkt. No. 57.  
24 Having reviewed Plaintiff's motion, the Court finds good cause likely exists to enter a revised  
25 protective order. Accordingly, rather than having this matter fully briefed, the Court ORDERS the  
26 parties to meet and confer in person to determine whether they can agree on a revised protective  
27 order, preferably based on this District's model. If the parties are unable to agree, they shall file a  
28 joint letter in compliance with the undersigned's Discovery Standing Order. Accordingly,  
Plaintiff's motion is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

29  
30 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

31  
32 Dated: August 28, 2015

33  
34  
35   
36 MARIA-ELENA JAMES  
37 United States Magistrate Judge